

REMARKS

The Official Action dated September 6, 2006 has been carefully considered. Consideration of the amendments and remarks presented herein and reconsideration of the rejections are respectfully requested. Applicants appreciate the Examiner allowing Claims 15 and 29.

Claims 3-6, 8-15, 18-20 and 22-29 remain in the present application. Claims 8 and 22 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification and claims as originally filed (for example, see page 8, lines 17-18 and Examples 2-10). Claims 1, 7, 16 and 21 were cancelled by previous amendment without prejudice. Accordingly, it is believed that these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter, and entry is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, claim 8 was objected to for failing to provide antecedent basis. Claim 8 has been amended accordingly and Applicants believe the present amendment overcomes the objection.

In the Official Action, claims 3-6, 8-14, 18-20 and 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Beach et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,874,172) in view of Robertson (U.S. Patent No. 4,504,313). Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion and traverse the same. Applicants have amended claims 8 and 22 to recite that the polyurethane mixture includes from about 9% to about 40% by weight of an additional graft polymer curative having at least two hydroxy and/or amino groups which includes at least one acrylate, silicone, polyether or polyester side chain. As noted by the Examiner, Beach et al fail to teach the additional graft curative, and, as such, the Examiner relied on the teachings of Robertson. However, Robertson fails to teach a polyurethane mixture having from about 9% to about 40% by weight of an additional graft curative. In contrast, Robertson teaches that the amount of polysiloxane mold release agent incorporated into the polyurethane can vary from 0.25 to 5% by weight of the total polyurethane formulation (col. 7, lines 4-7). In order to place the claimed invention in the possession of the public, references relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 must provide an enabling disclosure *In re Payne*, 203 U.S.P.Q. 245 (CCPA 1979). Here, the combination of Beach et al and Robertson fails to do so. As such, it is believed that Claims 8 and 22 and any claims depending thereon, as presently amended, are allowable and overcome the present rejection over Beach et al in view of Robertson.

**Serial No. 10/755,904
Amendment Dated December 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated September 6, 2006**

It is believed that the above amendments and remarks represent a complete response to the objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and as such, place the present application having claims 3-6, 8-15, 18-20 and 22-29 in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Clayton L. Kuhnell
Clayton L. Kuhnell
Reg. No. 48,691
Attorney for Applicants
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 E. Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 977-8377

1329553v1